Why Is The State Department Afraid to Let U.S. Reporters Visit China? See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 30 AUGUST 13, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Eden Calls Nasser A Hitler, and Treats Israel Like Czechoslovakia

On Adlai, Suez and Ike's Latest Arms Letter

In politically knowledgeable circles on the Hill, talk of a Southern revolt against Stevenson was not being taken seriously on the eve of the Convention. The last four years have been years without Federal patronage for the Democratic machines of the South; they are job hungry; "they learned their lesson in 1952"; they want a Democratic victory this year; and to revolt against Stevenson would be to play into the hands of Truman and Harriman. Stevenson can afford to be bold. His statement on civil rights nonetheless took courage. For our part, Stevenson's unexpected declaration that the platform ought unequivocally to endorse the Supreme Court's school decision was the first breath of fresh air in a stagnant campaign. It contrasts nicely with Eisenhower's disingenuous remark at press conference next day that he had given no thought to how the civil rights plank in the new Republican platform should be phrased.

The Suez dispute will end with a victory for Nasser and another humiliation for Britain. The only step taken by the Egyptian ruler which violates international obligations is his continued refusal to pass Israeli-bound vessels through the Canal, in defiance of the 1888 pact and a Security Council decision. But the Foreign Office in London last week, a few hours before Eden's speech, made it clear that England is willing to let Egypt go on violating its international obligations insofar as Israel is concerned. The one nation with a legitimate grievance over the Canal is not even invited to London. While Nasser is hysterically compared to Hitler, Israel is treated as cynically as was Czechoslovakia. Not law but oil and empire are the stakes. Dulles is worried lest Saudi Arabia seize Aramco, and Eden lest nationalization spread to Iraq. Both would be happy to serve up Ben Gurion's head on a platter if they could thereby appease Nasser. Egypt fears to touch Israel because Israel will fight but it does not fear the West because the West is bluffing, and the more Eden talks the more he builds up Nasser as a hero of the colonial world. It is for example slicing it a bit thick to say that one nation has no right to control an international artery when Britain's power for centuries has been based on holding just such strategic passes at Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, and Singapore. If Turkey can be trusted to control the Dardanelles and the U.S. the Panama Canal, why can't Egypt control the Suez? This is the question which will prove fatal at the coming conference. More than half the people of the world instinctively see no reason why Nasser shouldn't use Canal tolls to build up his poverty-stricken country if he does not abuse his power. Since the only instance of abuse has been excluded from the agenda by the Foreign Office, other Asian and African countries will conclude the real purpose is to retain control permanently of a waterway which was supposed to revert to Egypt in 12 years.

Election Bulletin

The drive for the votes of intellectuals in this election is becoming intense. One learned journal which rarely pays attention to our special problems, the New York *Daily News*, argued earnestly last Wednesday to those of us who had just finished reading Dick Tracy, "When you come right down to it, the GOP is the right party for any real intellectual—meaning a person who prides himself justly on being an independent thinker. . . . Any true intellectual who will give the GOP a try is more likely to find himself happier there than he ever was as a Democrat." (And, we timidly add, probably a lot better paid.)

The *Daily News* argues that the Republican party "as a rule" has been "hospitable to such thinkers" and has believed in "vigorous, objective, courteous discussion of ideas" while the Democratic party under Roosevelt and Truman "only paid lip service to free speech. . . . When you freely and publicly disagreed with them, their practice was to call you some dirty name(s) rather than answer with solid arguments." We hasten to pass this warm burst of understanding on to fellow thinkers. We're even polishing up a slogan, "There's no party like the GOP for the worried Ph.D."

Here in Washington offices have been opened for a Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower. We only pray that it will not get confused in future loyalty investigations with two arts and science organizations of similar name in past campaigns which ended up on the Attorney General's list. We hope this chills no ardor.

The Eisenhower letter to Bulganin is about as feeble a State paper as ever came out of Washington. There were reports here earlier in Stassen's entourage that the U.S. would seize the initiative by proposing some limitation on future nuclear tests, but at the last moment this was dropped and the decision made to let the correspondence expire. The Pentagon and State both dislike even talking about disarmament, and Washington for all its daily tidal inflow of news seems unaware of how deep is the fear the world over of nuclear testing and nuclear war. The President has just signed a bill making "In God We Trust" the national motto, but the new Moloch with its fiery furnace is all we really trust; our God the Father is become Fission-Fusion. When will the angels of our better nature again be heard?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parable: When A Geneticist Falls Out with the AEC on Fall Out

Two Theories (Both Sinister) on The Barring of U. S. Newsmen From China

If the State Department is afraid to let American reporters visit Communist China, it must fear that they would get a favorable impression of the country. This indicates that despite the position the Department takes publicly, it privately believes the Chinese Communists have not done a bad job, that there are improvements which would impress American visitors. We conclude from this that despite a decade of Congressional investigation and political purge the Department is still staffed with Far Eastern experts who secretly have a rather good opinion of the Chinese Communists. We hope Alfred Kohlberg is listening.

On the other hand, a source very close to, indeed not more than a few block away from, the Senate Internal Security Committee has it doped out this way. The Eisenhower Administration is secretly preparing to recognize Communist China after the election, and to arrange for its admission to the United Nations. The way Senator Eastland, Robert Morris and our informant whom we can only identify as Joe have it figured, the State Department is afraid its plans will be upset if American correspondents visit China next month and tell the American people about all the terrible things going on there. Whichever theory is true, a new Congressional investigation of the Department is urgent.

What's a "Responsible" Newsman?

We were intrigued by the State Department press officer who explained why the U.S., though for freedom of the press and communication, didn't want the American press to communicate about China. "We don't believe," he asserted with pomp, "any responsible American newsman will violate the policies and laws of this government." The phraseology is piquant. Why "*policies* and laws"? Newspapermen are not exempt from the laws, but since when has it been assumed that they are also bound by government policy? This particular officer is the one who helps sift the "responsible" sheep from the irresponsible goats in arranging who shall and shall not be admitted to those private press briefings at which the Department strictly off the record and not for attribution imparts the most startling generalities to a chosen few. Apparently his test of responsible journalism is whether it conforms to government policy. The Department's own conception of a free press is one that freely serves up what the Department wants dished out.

Free to Speak the Official Line

Like the passport cases, the refusal of permission to visit China is another example of the tendency to shut off free discussion by Americans abroad and on questions affecting foreign policy. Only a last minute change of heart forestalled another scandal of this sort at the World Health Organization meeting in Copenhagen last week. Prof. Herman J. Muller, Nobel prize winning geneticist and a leading authority on radiation effects upon heredity, is much more pessimistic than the majority of the Atomic Energy Commission about fallout hazards. The AEC would not permit him to make an oral presentation of a paper on the subject at the Atoms-for-Peace conference in Geneva last August. When the WHO invited him to speak in Copenhagen, he filled out fingerprint and personal data forms the State Department requires for U.S. citizens participating in UN activities. Prof. Muller waited in vain for clearance and then decided to go to Copenhagen anyway to attend the meeting held there the week before by the First International Congress of Human Genetics, a purely scientific gathering not subject to US or UN regulations. Prof. Muller was scheduled to speak last Tuesday at the WHO meeting. Cabled inquiries from WHO finally exhumed from a reluctant bureaucracy its original cable asking permission for Prof. Muller to speak. According to the *Washington Post* (Aug. 7), it had been marked "classified" and quietly buried at both the State Department and the AEC. A last minute request via the Public Health Service got results and the State Department over the week-end cabled permission for Prof. Muller to speak at the WHO meeting. The other American geneticist invited, J. V. Neel of the University of Michigan, had no such clearance trouble. "The State Department," the *Washington Post* reported, "saw no significance in the fact that Neel, unlike Muller, has openly sided with AEC's views. . . ."

Lesson for the NAACP

Like the labor movement, the NAACP has taken a "neutralist" attitude toward the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee. Both have assumed that as long as they were let alone what happened to a few unpopular radicals or artists was no business of theirs. But now Georgia and Alabama are beginning to demonstrate how dangerous is the precedent which allows legislatures and courts to pillory unpopular people under the guise of investigating organizations suspected of "subversion." The NAACP is being given the "committee" treatment. It would only take a change of atmosphere to apply the same techniques in the South and elsewhere to the labor movement. Neither NAACP nor labor has paid any attention to the Abe Flaxer case, now being appealed to the Supreme court; this head of a defunct Left union was sentenced to jail for contempt because he refused to produce his membership lists, just as NAACP is quite rightly refusing to produce them in the South.

At Sea Over The Suez

There seems to be a shortage of geography books among the military experts in London, at least among those who are briefing American correspondents on the Suez. "Some military experts here," William Richardson reported breathlessly from London in the New York Post of August 3, "asked a very merciless question which will have to be faced sooner or later: 'Suppose Russia uses Egypt-held Suez to ship a flock of submarines into the Mediterranean to be based, say, in Communist Albania?' This is a possibility which would literally change the entire conventional or non-atomic strategic picture in the world."

We do not wish to change the whole world strategic picture overnight either, but if Mr. Richardson's experts can commandeer a geography book they will find that they have misplaced two seas, the Black and the Baltic, and that Russian submarines can reach the Mediterranean and Albania from either without going through the Suez. Russian submarines from Soviet Pacific ports could also have reached Albania at any time round the Cape of Good Hope, or for that matter—since the Suez is open to warships—through the Canal itself like any other nation's warships. We challenge Mr. Richardson to document his dispatch, say with the name of the pub where he stumbled over these military experts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Time to Spend Less on Massive Retaliation, More on Protecting The Home Front

Holifield Report Says Civil Defense Not Hopeless in Atomic War

For every dollar the United States now spends on the armed forces, it spends one-fifth of a penny for civil defense. Yet in a nuclear war, the extent to which the civilian population can survive and carry on will be decisive. The propaganda of the armed forces and the aviation industry is focused on the power of retaliation. But the power of retaliation is only the power to bring about mutual destruction. The big bombers may destroy the enemy, but what if they return to a bombed out homeland with all its supply lines, human and mechanical, in hopeless chaos?

The Holifield subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee in a report filed the day before Congress adjourned tried to bring this reality home to the people of this country. Unfortunately, as we pointed out last week, scant attention has been paid its report, "Civil Defense for National Survival." The report is especially important because the subcommittee, after extending hearings in which it interrogated 212 witnesses, concluded that a shelter program was possible, and might make a difference of 60 million casualties or more in the event of all-out war.

One Area In Which Peace Is Assumed

The scientist who made this estimate was Dr. Merle A. Tuve, a member of the original S-Committee set up by President Roosevelt in 1939 for the utilization of uranium fission, now chairman of the Civil Defense Committee of the National Academy of Sciences. In his testimony before the Holifield subcommittee he criticized "the careful avoidance of civil defense matters by our Air Force and our AEC [Atomic Energy Commission], despite their daily concern with the devastatingly grim facts of nuclear warfare" and observed ironically that civil defense activities "are the only defense activities of our government . . . which seem to be based . . . squarely on the proposition that war is not coming."

No Place to Go

"As larger weapons appear, dispersal distances must be greatly increased to be effective. Under the dread circumstances, entirely possible, that a few large weapons could contaminate the whole United States with radioactivity to casualty producing levels, the value of dispersal (without shelter) drops to zero."

—Civil Defense for National Survival.

Dr. Tuve was pessimistic about complete atomic disarmament. He said "there is not the slightest hope that civilized nations will destroy, by common consent, their ability to carry out nuclear warfare, for the simple reason that the total stock of explosive material is already far too large for any detailed accounting." He said reasonable men still hoped for limitation, but the best this could do was to "reduce nuclear warfare initially to perhaps a few hundred stupendously big bangs." But he added that "only 50 or 70 of such explosions" would be enough to make large parts of the country temporarily unlivable.

"Any nuclear war will inflict grave damage," Dr. Tuve declared, "but 60 percent of the casualties and deaths can be avoided . . . if reasonable preparations are made. A civil defense effort costing several billions of dollars and spread out over a few years may mean a difference of 60 million casualties or more in the event of all-out war."

Why Evacuation Is Nonsense

"As the shadow of the impending intercontinental ballistics missile lengthens over the world, the Federal Civil Defense Administration is beginning to see that the half hour or so in which such a missile can travel from Moscow to Chicago or elsewhere, even if allowed as warning time, is hopeless as a basis for evacuation. . . .

"In great metropolitan areas like Los Angeles, surrounded by ocean, mountains, and desert, evacuation is regarded as absurd. . . . The deputy chief of police, Los Angeles, Arthur C. Hohmann, reminded the subcommittee, if it needed reminding, that the mere appearance of a popular singer in Palm Springs caused a traffic jam from Los Angeles, which took many hours to overcome."

—Civil Defense for National Survival.

The subcommittee believes that the key measure is a shelter program, that a group shelter construction program must be planned and financed by the Federal government, that a public investment of $2 to $3 billion a year over a 6-year period "will accomplish the primary tasks of civil defense" and that this amount "even if taken from the military budget, probably would return more security dividends, dollar for dollar, than they do as military outlays."

What $8 Billions Could Do

The direct expenditure on the armed forces today runs between $35 and $40 billions a year. One engineer witness, from American Machine & Foundry, which has worked on a special dome shelter design, estimated that the average shelter cost per person, excluding land costs, might be $50 a person or about $8 billions for the whole country, about one-fifth the annual military budget.

The Holifield committee has performed a service in showing there are unexplored possibilities in civil defense, and the delusive folly (see boxes on this page) of depending on evacuation. Unfortunately there is no civil defense bureaucracy like the military's to press for study, action, and expenditure, and no great business to lobby for civil defense as the aviation industry does for the Air Force and nuclear strategy.

The Holifield report terms the 1950 civil defense act obsolete, calls for new legislation to vest basic responsibility in the Federal government, proposes the creation of a Department of Civil Defense with Cabinet level prestige: "Civil Defense," it says, "must be as permanent a feature of our national life as military defense."

This report may be used as an effective focal point for discussion not only of civil defense but of the ultimate and only sure safeguard against the nuclear terror—the elimination of hate in the human family and the recognition of the necessity for co-existence. Here is a point of departure for a new peace movement, beginning at the community level.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Quick Look Round The Capitol and Globe

Guide to the Perplexed Democrat: McCarthy predicts the Presidential election will be "very, very close" if the Democrats nominated Symington or Lausche. . . . *Freudian Slip:* James Reston, reporting the President's press conference (New York *Times,* Aug. 2), had Mr. Eisenhower saying "he would have preferred to have Mr. Stassen stick to his job of disarming the Russians." The official transcript shows the slip was Reston's not Eisenhower's; it unconsciously reflects the real Washington attitude toward disarmament negotiations. . . . *Silly Season Over Suez:* Glubb Pasha out of London for the North American Newspaper Alliance (Aug. 1) "there are basic differences in outlook and character between Arabs and Egyptians, who are not in reality Arabs at all . . . [Nasser] is doing immense harm to genuine Arab nationalism." If the Egyptians aren't Arabs, neither are most of the Lebanese, Syrians and Palestinians since they too were only "Arabized" by Muhammed's proselytizing armies out of Arabia, the ancestors of all four were Greek-speaking Hellenistic peoples. . . .

Plot-of-The-Week: The 250-pound Georgia prison guard who testified that those poor rock quarry convicts broke their own legs in a "mutilation plot . . . planned to make it appear that brutality existed." . . . *Odd Kind of "Civilians":* William F. Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL-CIO in a letter to Chairman Strauss of the AEC, called attention to a recent editorial in the *Oak Ridger* which said that while the Atomic Energy Act was intended to remove the atom program from military control, "General after General has been appointed to key AEC posts. . . ." Schnitzler accused Strauss of taking part in a "deliberate" campaign to restore military control. . . . *Clericalism in Israel:* The *Jerusalem Post* (July 20) scolded the Chief Rabbis of Israel for intolerance in objecting to Dr. Nelson Glueck's suggestion for Reform services (in Hebrew!) in the library of the proposed new Archaeological School in Jerusalem. The semi-official *Post* said, "because in the peculiar political structure of Israel, the Chief Rabbis are able to exercise certain force and pressure does not derogate from the moral reprehensibility" of dictating to non-Orthodox religious Jews. . .

Unreported in the U.S. Press: Attlee's tart reply in the House of Lords July 25 to British propaganda nonsense about Cyprus only being 40 miles from Turkey so that it wouldn't be fair to return it to Greece: "It was most astonishing," the Laborite Earl said, "for a representative of the Foreign Office to say the possession of an island 40 miles away from another country was a serious menace to that country. This was a remarkable statement from a country that has the Channel Islands, Malta, Cyprus, Hongkong and the Falkland Islands."

Free Enterprise Utopia

"Venezuela . . . is a country, say Alfred Jankus and Neil M. Malloy in 'Venezuela: Land of Opportunity' where 'the barrooms are large and always full of people; the libraries small and always empty.' Messrs. Jankus and Malloy consider it an ideal spot for a forward-looking business man."

—Business Bookshelf, N. Y. Times, Aug. 6

Up to Their Old Tricks: The Tablet (London), probably the most distinguished Catholic weekly in the English language, carries an article in its July 14 issue on the cynical devices by which West German courts are denying compensation to Stateless persons under the new restitution law, which provides payments for those persecuted by the Nazis. A gypsy boy who lost his mother and contracted TB in concentration camp was denied compensation on the ground that he suffered not from "persecution" but merely from "police measures in line with the general European attitude toward gypsies as a-social elements." The Bavarian Land Court dismissed the claim of a Polish Catholic Anti-Nazi on the ground that "since the Nazis rejected the Poles as an inferior race, they would have considered their political convictions as a matter of no concern." . . .

Nelson Decision Stands: Another welcome victim of the adjournment rush was the bill to reverse the Supreme Court's decision in the Nelson case, annulling State sedition laws. . . . *Ammunition Against the Un-American Committee:* The *Denver Post* editorial in July calling for its abolition; the *New York Times* editorial "Hit and Run" (Aug. 4) criticizing its attack on the Fund for the Republic; the new Artists Equity Code of Ethics calling for a boycott against any "activity involving discrimination as to race, creed *or ideology.*" . . . *And a Hat's Off:* To Judge Bigelow and his supporters in New Jersey.

Don't Forget—You Can Have Free Sample Copies for The Friends You Make on Vacation

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone..... State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

8/13/56

City ..... Zone..... State.....

City ..... Zone..... State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED